

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

Volume VII

JUNE 1953

Number 84

CONTENTS

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE	The Editor 522
GRACE IS COMMON	Alan C. Clark 525
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH	Hugh Farmer 533
TEMPTATIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH	Henri de Lubac 539
PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION	S. M. Albert, O.P. 550
FR STEUART, S.J.	E. Roberts and K. Kendall 557
POINT OF VIEW	D.B.S. 561
WORKS ON OUR LADY	Gerard M. Corr 562
REVIEWS	Columba Cary-Elwes, Gerard Meath 564
NOTICES	566
EXTRACTS	567

Contributors are encouraged to submit original MSS. or translations from the Fathers. *Literary Communications* to be addressed to The Editor, The Life of the Spirit, Spode House, Rugeley, Staffs. (Telephone: Armitage 240.) The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of MSS. submitted, and no MS. will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. *Subscriptions, Orders and Communications regarding Advertisements* should be addressed to the Manager, Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1 (Museum 5728). Annual Subscription 17s. 6d. post free (U.S.A. \$2.50). *Binding:* Orders and Enquiries for binding volumes of the review may be sent to the Kemp Hall Bindery, 33 St Aldate's, Oxford.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE

THE EDITOR

IT would seem that today we stand on the threshold of a great movement for unity. Or perhaps it would be better to use the term 'unification', for people have always desired union with some reality which is regarded as ultimate. Now, however, people are anxious also to gather up the bits and pieces of human life that has become so dissected, and make them into a single whole, where peace at last may be found. Particularly since the sixteenth century men have been broken into many parts. An international order that seemed at one time almost practicable has been shattered by increasing individualism among nations. Society itself has been turned into a collection of units so that the benefits of invention and industry have largely been turned into instruments of separating man from man. In religion each man wanted to be his own Pope and to keep the Bible for his own personal interpretation, while religious thinkers multiplied systems and distinctions in their desire for rational accuracy. Perhaps the most harmful separation was caused by the desire to understand scriptural truth which led to a concentration upon the explanation of biblical texts, till at last the Bible itself disappeared behind a huge wall of religious and 'spiritual' tomes. The life of the spirit was fed, not by the revealed instrument fit for the whole man, but by 'steps' and 'ladders' and 'ways' and spiritual textbooks, which were more concerned with the 'nights' and the 'ways' than they were with the life of Christian grace.

Now all this is being changed, at least by the intense desire for a whole reality. Even in the international order the modern means of transport and communication are teaching men to think of the world as a whole. There are signs too that man at least understands the danger of mechanism and plans to master the machine for the good of society. And for those who had for so long been content with secondhand 'spirituality' there has arisen a movement to recapture the Scriptures and the Liturgy for the normal

life of man hoping for heaven. A most encouraging sign of this may be found in the recent publication of the massive, single volume, *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*.¹ It is not only that the editors have attempted in the compass of one volume to introduce the Bible as a whole and in all its parts, and to comment on all the parts; nor is it simply that over forty English-speaking biblical specialists have by the masterly and masterful work of four editors been gathered into a joint effort and encouraged to give of their best; the most hopeful sign lies in the fact that these 2,600 closely packed columns are the result of an endeavour to reintegrate the immense progress in biblical scholarship into the Christian's understanding of the Scriptures. In this sense it may be said that the work, although eminently scholarly, is not a work of scholarship. Hitherto scholars have run down their own alleyways supremely interested in discovery, but caring little about the relevance to the life of men of the bits of information unearthed by them.

The Preface to the Commentary says that it is 'the result of nine years' work by a group of scholars who believe that biblical learning must be integrated with traditional Christianity if it is to bear any spiritual message or fruit for modern society'. The intention of writing the volume was to feed the spirit of man by the Spirit of God, which is what the Scriptures do to those who are concerned to learn of God. Those who are anxious only to learn human knowledge, who study Hebrew, history and comparative religions merely to dissect the materials of the Bible are not necessarily so fed; they are often too intent upon the multiplicity of the words. The unity of the Word of God, however, can gather all their learning and scholarship into a single life, the life of the Spirit.

In the past this was the accepted attitude towards the Scriptures. St Thomas, despite his skilful use of the pagan Aristotle in sacred science, remained always and essentially a 'Master of the Sacred Page'. For him Sacred Doctrine was fundamentally the mind of man working systematically upon

¹ *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, Edited by Bernard Orchard, o.s.b., Edmund Sutcliffe, s.j., Reginald Fuller, and Ralph Russell, o.s.b. (Nelson; £4 4s.)

Holy Writ to discover God and the way to God in final blessedness. Again, any page of St John of the Cross will show that he never left the Sacred Page to wander after his own ideas however beautiful or mystical. We cannot, of course, return to older methods and simply ignore the workings of men's minds since the time of Aquinas or yet of St John of the Cross. There is no going back. But going forward now is going back to the Bible, the Word of God, which is still present with us today—as the Holy Father has shown us in his Encyclical on the Bible. We have to take all these investigations, these literary, archeological and theological findings and replace them in their true setting. This can only be done fully in the Church which remains the Word of God on earth, the Mystical Body of Christ.

Thus the first article in the Commentary deals with 'The Place of the Bible in the Church'. 'It is impossible to understand the Bible aright and its message unless the Bible itself be first viewed in its right setting, i.e. not merely as the eclectic product of certain outstanding members of that divine society that has existed in the world ever since God called Abram out of Ur of the Chaldees, but rather as the divinely inspired crystallisation of the spirit and teaching of that society at times and places specially chosen by the Spirit of God dwelling within it'. It may be regretted that the authors of this first article could not have shaken themselves free of the outworn apologetic approach which has always tended towards division rather than union. They could have gone on to show how the Spirit of Christ yet lives, how the Word is still uttered because the Church is the Word of God on earth. Christ's voice still speaks to us today in the Scriptures, but not so much in the dead letter of historical books as in the living Church who gathers even now all truth within her fruitful womb to bring it forth continuously with the character of its true lineage impressed upon it. In the Word are all things made and from him are brought forth all things both new and old.

But the authors of this Commentary manage on the whole to rid themselves of that destructive spirit of fear in the face of progressive knowledge that has so often marked our apologetics. Rightly they draw into their net—St Peter's net

—the living, jumping, writhing catch of so many great non-Catholic biblical scholars. And as their sense of security within the living Word of God grows so will they be able to push forward fearlessly in their work of unification. In the present issue of *THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT* there is barely suggested the foundation of that unification—the Spirit in the Church, the Eucharistic, living Symbol of the Word, where this Word is both spoken to the mind and fed to the will—such is our secure foundation.

Finally a word should be said about the magnificent production of this Commentary which in a few weeks has outrun its first printing of 5,000 copies. That success is due, after the brilliant work of editors and authors, to the non-Catholic firm of Nelson who have made it typographically so attractive. The smallish type is yet clear to read; the binding and general presentation are not drab or undistinguished as so much similar work has been in the past. There is here in fact a unification in production between editors, authors, printers, binders and publishers.



GRACE IS COMMON

ALAN C. CLARK

IT is a strange fact of history that the Church does not escape some loss when she has to engage in doctrinal controversy. So much has been gained, such steps forward in the clarification of doctrine made, that it is only after a period of years that the suspicion grows that the whole truth has not yet been said. Yet closer analysis of the nature of 'controversial theology' shows how inevitable this must be. From the first the Catholic protagonist suffers the disadvantage of being forced to fight on ground chosen by his adversary. If he is able, he will seize his opponent's weapons and turn them against their owner. But what has happened? He is left victorious in a field not of his own choosing and with weapons not of his own making, effective though they were in the historical context of the controversy. Further, the controversies, however much they bear on eternal truths,

are 'of a period' and the terms of reference belong to that period. The exigencies of the moment demand that the Catholic mind be concentrated on the disputed points, and to give an overall picture of the doctrine becomes less important. It is only when the controversy ceases to stir and agitate apologists that the Church has the opportunity of pointing to aspects of the overall doctrine which are equally necessary for its understanding.

Now the theology of grace suffered severely from these limitations. It was the Reformers who chose the ground of attack, proclaiming the utter degeneracy of fallen man and making his justification a juridic fiction, meanwhile reducing efficacious grace to an irresistible force applied to an impotent, corrupt object. The terms and limits of the debate were thereby fixed. The Council of Trent, expounding the deposit of faith, was moved to stress the *reality* of justification for each individual man, to show that *he* was now really a child of God, not merely the same depraved child of sin whose inevitable sinning God decides to overlook. The answers, it is clear, are to Luther's questions: how am *I* justified? What does *my* redemption mean? How does grace work in *me*? It is the individual man vis-à-vis his Judge which is under theological scrutiny. Trent is answering the great cry of the Christian: what must I be if I am to achieve my eternal destiny?

In the face of the dire attack of the Protestant Reform, the individual Christian received at the Council of Trent the solemn dogmatic declaration of his supernatural birth-right. Nothing had been left to chance by the Fathers of the Council, for they sensed that the genuine rebirth of the Christian by baptism must be defended at all costs against the disruptive, nominalist attack of Luther. In the heavy effort, successful though it was, to consolidate this traditional doctrine, other aspects of the reality of grace had to be left aside: there was at the Council an atmosphere of emergency. It was not to be expected, therefore, that the controversialists and the preachers would escape the self-imposed limitations of conciliar doctrine. They were after all as much children of their time as their opponents. They were as deeply inheritors of the Renaissance obsession for individual

values as were Lutheran or Calvinist. What they said cannot be gainsaid, especially as so much of it is no more than a re-statement of some of the most treasured doctrines of the faith. Nor can one cavil at the fact that they concentrated on these at the expense perhaps of other that now appear to us as more precious: they would have been mediocre controversialists had they not done so. But that their angle of vision should shape all theology since their time, since the age of the Counter Reformation—is this to be desired?

It would be a bad underestimate of the weight of the attack at the Reformation if we restricted it to the dispute over the nature of the individual's justification and its consequences. A serious onslaught was made on the very fabric of church order and government. Luther grouped his *individual* Christians together as the true 'invisible Church' at war with the false visible Church of Rome. The great, hierarchic power of the Catholic Church with its far-reaching visible authority, firmly established by Innocent III, was now being seriously challenged and that challenge demanded an immediate answer. All controversy therefore bent towards establishing anew these widespread claims, and the language in which those claims were defended was predominantly the language of jurists. The most effective counter in fact was to 'juridicise' the Church of Christ, to set forth the bonds that bound all its 'units' together under a supreme authority established by Christ. This defence was skilful and adequate, and the Church has lived to see the day when Protestantism, by an inevitable inner logic, has split asunder into a multitude of sects and groupings, each with its own tenets and each of these tenets valid on the criterion of private judgment. The Church indeed was left undefeated, but its theologians had got so used to their equipment that they were content, it would seem, to allow themselves to be preoccupied with polishing anew weapons they had used in a controversy that was now no longer an issue of the day.

It cannot be forgotten, however, that the preoccupations of theologians have an extensive influence on the way in which the doctrine of the Church is emphasised in pulpit or confessional. In fact, the spirituality of the Church takes

definite shape and form from that emphasis. Not that the truth is not preserved intact: but the integrity of the truth does not prevent over-emphasis in one direction which in turn forms a certain 'mind' in the Church. Let us face the fact that in much Catholic theology the idea of the Christian is synonymous with the idea of the *individual* Christian, and Christian life identified with the life of the *individual* Christian. We will examine the implications of such an attitude in a few moments. But here it is well to note that even the pastor of souls, being responsible before God for each and every one under his care, tends to *think* of their salvation as so many independent salvations. As so often happens, Catholic practice has transcended theory, and the priest who sees his people as a community in need of being energised by real charity if they are to progress in grace, is not in fact the exception. The existence of the missions, the great sense of the need for reparation among the faithful, the constant self-sacrifice shown in many works of mercy and charity: all these facts give the lie to any suggestion that the Church has ever lost the perception of the living unity of her members one with another. Even the busy Fathers of the Council of Trent did not fail to give the outline of the dignity of the just man in terms of his participation in the divine life along with his fellows. But the *individualistic* attitude still remains with us, and sometimes even shows signs of hardening rather than yielding. This is understandable in face of the fact that the 'collective' idea has been given a distorted presentation by avowed enemies of the Church. That is true but does not explain fully why there is not nearly enough participation by the faithful in the liturgical life of the Church, and ignorance of the Scriptures still remains one of our besetting sins. Often enough the reaction to attempts to introduce 'reforms' in any of these directions is lukewarm, even hostile. But the time has surely come for us to re-examine our position in all fields but especially in the theological field, and to ask ourselves whether the theology of grace does not need some new research.

It is time then to make some simple, undisguised assertions, some of which may be regarded as obvious, others perhaps as unwarranted inferences from the facts. The first

fact has already been stated in the foregoing paragraphs: that there still exists a strong attitude of mind that sees salvation as a purely private responsibility. That attitude, we assert, has as its part cause at least an unbalanced presentation of the doctrine of grace and the supernatural life which arises from the uncritical assumption that answering the questions put by the Protestant Reform about *my* salvation yielded an integral doctrine of grace. The wrong inference has been made that these questions indicate the principal issue for the Christian: that he must from the time of his baptism busy himself with the isolated problem of his own salvation. But such a preoccupation, if I put the matter personally, means that I have forgotten who is this 'me' I am planning for. After all, I can hardly have a right attitude of mind until I am quite sure what I am now in the new dispensation. The blunt truth, paradox though it may first appear, is that, taken on my own and in isolation, I do not really count because I simply am not there to count! For that is not the way I have been re-made in the grace of God. In the hypothetical order of nature it may make sense to think in individualistic terms: but in the real order of grace it is quite honestly nonsense. God loves me as I really am, not as I may think I am. God loves me in fact as a member of Christ along with all his other disciples. My whole worth is that I am a small shoot on a very great Vine which is Christ: there are thousands of other branches, big and small, on that Vine. The idea, then, that my own isolated needs are important independently of the all-round growth of the Vine is not God's idea. Indeed, my own salvation could never be something merely individual and private, for it is the heart of Christ's message that outside the Vine there is no salvation. The conclusion therefore is that my salvation cannot be discussed save in terms of that Vine: it is irrevocably bound up with the salvation of other men.

The Christian angle of vision can never accept such a person as an isolated unit in the community of grace. We have been too long passive in the face of the liberal and purely ethical philosophy of the value of the isolated person. It is philosophically valid to consider such a conception as long as we do not forget that it remains an 'abstraction'.

We can indeed, and we do, examine the inter-relations of these 'abstractions', their rights and duties and so forth, in that hypothetical world of reason. But such considerations have never been the mainspring of Christian thinking: the Gospels hold no brief for such speculations. It comes to this, that there will not be any really progressive Christian thinking until the subject of that thought is man as he really is: in the order of grace, not nature. The whole force of theological discussion on the necessity of grace lies in the fact that without grace it is impossible for fallen man to live *humanly*. A sinner obviously does not cease to be a man, but he does cease to be the man whom God envisaged when he made him to his own image and likeness. The revelation given us by Christ presents us with the mystery of our re-making in grace, what we *are* now that Christ has redeemed us. We are free to contract out of God's supernatural destiny for us: but we will never see our way to living that supernatural destiny unless we accept ourselves as we really are.

It is not to be denied that the re-assessment of ourselves, and the need for all Christian thinking to take as its terms of reference the redeemed world of grace which breaks down the frontiers of the 'natural' does not give rise to a thousand doubts and queries. What, for example, of personal merit? Of personal guilt? Of personal sanctification? These also are specifically Christian ideas. How are they to be reconciled with these others we are elevating to a supreme place in Christian thought? We admit the force of such objections but hold firmly to the need for pursuing our central idea before they can be satisfactorily answered.

If it is true that my status in the world of grace, the real world in which I live, is not that of an isolated Christian but a member of Christ, then God will see me as this when he dispenses his grace. When therefore he gives me grace, he is not just thinking of me or loving me for my own sake. I am indeed of immense worth in his sight, for I was redeemed by the precious blood of his Son; but my worth remains always that of a member of the Mystical Body of his Son. So, in dispensing grace, he is looking at the whole living Body. He is thinking of all those whom under the power of that grace I shall meet who need the warmth and

strength of divine love. He is providing for his poor, his sick, for those in need of comfort and sound advice, for children, for experts, and for those burdened with heavy responsibilities. He cannot go against his own handiwork and consider me apart from his other cherished and dearly loved sons. I am what I am in his sight—a member among members: never at any moment in thought, word, deed, or desire can I be anything else.

The world of grace, however, is the world of freedom. We are living members one of another, free to welcome divine love, able unfortunately to reject it. It has always been so. Though God looks through and beyond me when he enlightens my mind and strengthens my heart, he also asks me freely to accept this mission. In fact, in so far as I freely share in the redemption of the world, my personal dignity is far more vindicated than it would have been in a 'private' economy of salvation. I am working with God, not just being fashioned by God. Questions of personal merit and guilt receive therefore far greater significance. I am being asked not merely to sanctify myself, but to sanctify myself that others may be sanctified, and my responsibility is vastly increased. My sanctification comes in fact in the degree that I 'lose' myself in others.

But there is an obverse side to this tremendous truth which is full of life-giving consolation. If God is thinking of others when he grants grace to me, he is equally thinking of me when he grants grace to others. How fully does one's personal experience corroborate this: the favours, the services, the love and wisdom that have come to us from friend and even perhaps foe. Our personality has grown in the warmth and friendship of the Vineyard, and our spiritual debt is often to creditors unknown. The Body is jointed tightly in the tension of grace.

This doctrine has an all-embracing importance. It suggests to the theologian that grace should not be divided into '*gratum faciens*' and '*gratis data*' as between two *contraries*. The former carries with it something of the formality of the latter. It suggests that grace is given in respect of the Mystical Body of Christ. It shows rather radically that the Catholic theologian and the Catholic sociologist are condemn-

ing their inquiries to some degree of sterility unless they take as their criterion of judgment the *operative* law of the redeemed world of fact, the law of charity, for it is only in terms of that law that we see the real status of man. This is not a denial of the validity of considerations based on natural law; but it does suggest the ultimate ineffectiveness of such a closed system of reference. In the light of this doctrine much of Christ's teaching becomes clearer. Christ's identification with his brethren ceases to have the stamp of extrinsic appropriation. The parable of the king at the Last Judgment is seen to be true allegory, even as the parable of the vine. The Christian before his judge is examined according to the basic law of charity. It is taken for granted that he is dead to serious sin; the degree to which he has turned all his life and effort away from himself and towards Christ in his brethren will decide his glory. In fact, what we have here is in the nature of a revolutionary change of emphasis—the older emphasis did not lack something of Protestantism in it. We are guided here in our thoughts on the value of the Liturgy and the direction of all apostolate. But the doctrine remains principally a spur to the theologian in his expositions of the treasures of the faith. For the theologian remains the creator of Catholic thought. From his patient and humble inquiry there arises a body of principle which specialists in all fields must draw on and see whether they themselves, after all, are not mistaking the road. There will always be a tension between the claims of the individual and those of the community. The Mystical Body is to be seen as the *living* synthesis of these two fundamental energies, neither of which can be denied without destroying the other. Alone on the plane of Grace can we see the beginnings of a unity which the human heart is ever seeking.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

HUGH FARMER, O.S.B.

ALTHOUGH the doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul is perhaps more widely appreciated than formerly, it may be doubted whether the same can be said of that of the Holy Spirit living and operating in the Church as a whole. Sometimes we are so preoccupied with human failings in the Church's members that we tend to forget the intimate presence in the Church of the Divine Guest whose gifts show her to be an *opus plane divinum*, as Pope Leo XIII called her. We tend to forget that the Church is a theophany, that the 'Trinity in Unity is apparent in the unity of the Church—the Father, as the principle to which we are united, the Son as the milieu in which we are united, the Holy Spirit as the tie by which we are united: and all is one'. (Bossuet: *Lettre sur l'Unité de l'Eglise*.)

Although the early Church was by no means exclusively composed of holy and perfect members, there was in those days, one may think, a more widespread realisation of God's presence in the Church, specially attributed to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. The catechumens were asked if they believed 'in the Holy Spirit who is in the Catholic Church for the Resurrection from the Dead'. For St Hippolytus, the catechumen should 'hasten to the Church, for it is there that the Holy Spirit flourishes'. For St Irenaeus, the Holy Spirit is co-extensive with the Church: 'where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where God's Spirit is, there is the Church and all grace'. And St John Chrysostom, anticipating the teaching of the Vatican Council, saw the continued existence of the Church as a sign of the Holy Spirit's presence: 'If the Spirit were not there, the Church would no longer subsist, but if the Church subsists, it is evident that the Spirit is there.'

What was the foundation of their conviction? Surely our Lord's promise of the Holy Spirit, which was fulfilled at Pentecost and is still being fulfilled now.

In his last discourse our Lord not only revealed the exist-

ence of the Holy Spirit as a divine Person in the Trinity, but also spoke of him as one who would shortly come to the Apostles, to the Church, to remain with it for ever. But his Presence will be active, not passive—in fact it is through his activity in the Church and in the soul that we know that the Holy Spirit is a Person. Being the Spirit of Truth, he will lead the Church ‘into all Truth’. Being the Spirit of the Son, he will recall to the Apostles ‘all that the Son has taught them’. He will teach them the same doctrine as the Son, but will give them a deeper understanding of it. He will not speak ‘of himself’ but will bear witness to the Son, and the Apostles, under his guidance, will do the same. His presence in the Church will be so great a benefit that it is an advantage to the Apostles that our Lord should leave them, for, according to the will of the Father, the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, will be sent by them both only after our Lord’s return to heaven. His work of revelation, redemption and sanctification will be continued and completed by the Holy Spirit and the Church. The visible mission of the Son will be fulfilled by the visible and invisible missions of the Holy Spirit—not by a merely temporal succession but because the Father sends us the Spirit of the glorified Christ, which Christ himself first received without measure, and which he merited on the cross for the Mystical Body of which he is the Head.

Hence is seen the intimate connection between the Paschal Mystery and that of Pentecost. Mystically born from the Saviour’s side on the cross, the Church became clearly known to the eyes of men at Pentecost. ‘Then it was that the Holy Spirit animated the organism already formed (by Christ), giving to each organ its operation, and to the whole body life, vigour and growth’, as Diekmann has put it. Before Pentecost there were sons of God who had received the indwelling of the Spirit, but then it was that the Holy Spirit gathered them all into one mighty society of the elect, the Church, which was thus fully constituted only on the day of Pentecost. The redemptive work of our Lord’s passion and death was brought to fulfilment at Pentecost. The building up of the Mystical Body by the distribution of graces for various offices is attributed to the glorified Christ (Eph. 4, 8-12) and

to the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12, 1-15)—graces of knowledge, graces of miracles, of prophecy, tongues, and various ministries—‘but one and the same Spirit worketh all these things, dividing to every one according as he will’.

This vivifying principle of the Mystical Body, Pius XII teaches us, dwells ‘whole in the Head, whole in the Body, and whole in each of its members’. He ‘really exists and is operative both in the whole structure and in each one of its parts’. (*Mystici Corporis* 55 & 60.) Not only does the *gratia capitis* unite us to Christ, but also and principally it is the Holy Spirit who performs this function, he who according to St Thomas is the ‘principal and ultimate perfection of the whole Mystical Body’. Not only do we receive the created gifts of grace and the virtues, but, above all, we receive the Holy Spirit himself, the uncreated Gift—*Donum Dei Altissimi*.

The Holy Spirit in his turn forms Christ in us, and unites us to Christ our Head so that ‘with him we form one Mystical Person’ (*Mystici Corporis* 67). He continues, in an analogous way in the Church, his proper role within the Trinity. Proceeding from the love of the Father and the Son for each other, he is, as it were, the term of their activity. As uncreated love, he is the link that unites them, so that he is called *Nexus* and *Amor*. (cf. I, 37, 1, ad 3.) For St Augustine, ‘the union (*societas*) of the unity of the Church is as it were the proper work of the Holy Spirit . . . because the Holy Spirit himself is the union of the Father and the Son . . . for being the Spirit of both, he is held in common by each’.

So close, indeed, is his union with the Church that the Holy Spirit was called—analogically of course—the ‘soul of the Church’ by several of the Fathers, and the term has been recalled by Leo XIII. The Holy Spirit, being infinite and uncreated, cannot enter into composition with any created being; he cannot therefore be properly a formal cause, a component element that is modified and limited by the matter which it informs. But he is the perpetual principle of the Church’s life, growth and activity in the supernatural order in a transcendent way that is without any exact equivalent in the created universe. How, then, is he in the Church?

St Basil, in a difficult passage of *De Spiritu Sancto* (ch. 26), compares his presence to that of a Platonic idea, and, through his gifts, to that of the whole in the parts. But St Augustine is more explicit and precise. Making use of the Platonist teaching that the soul is life, he teaches: 'the Holy Spirit is to the Body of Christ which is the Church what the soul is to the human body: the Holy Spirit accomplishes (*agit*) in the whole Church what our soul accomplishes in all the members of one body . . . it enlivens all the members, it sees through the eyes, hears through the ears, speaks through the tongue . . . it is present to all the members at once, it gives life to them all, and their functions to each. . . . Their offices are different, but their life is common to all. So also in the Church of God (the Spirit) works miracles in some saints, in others he speaks truth, in others he preserves conjugal fidelity . . . each accomplishes his own work, but they all live in the same way.' There is then, he continues, 'one body and one spirit (Eph. 4, 4); by the human spirit or soul I command the members to move . . . the tongue to speak, the hands to work, the feet to walk. The members are different, but one spirit contains them all. Many things are commanded, many things are accomplished, but one commands and one is served. . . . The one body lives by the one spirit, and individual members that are cut off from the Church no longer live.'

St Augustine writes again: 'The faithful must belong to the Body of Christ if they wish to live by the Spirit of Christ—for only the Body of Christ lives by the Spirit of Christ. . . . If anyone is not a member of Christ, he does not live by his Spirit.'

Thus the Holy Spirit is the principle of the Church's supernatural life and action. Principle of the variety of states of life and different offices in the Church's organisation, and of different types of holiness, the Holy Spirit is also the principle of unity. First, and fundamentally, because he unites us to Christ, secondly because he is the common source of all good actions, and thirdly as the principle of exterior unity round the Vicar of Christ, which is seen to be the manifestation of the divine presence in the Church, and the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer 'that they all may be one'.

The Spirit of unity is also the Spirit of holiness. The Church is holy principally because the Holy Spirit dwells and operates within her. Her holiness is not constituted by the holiness of her members but by the Holy Spirit. The holiness of the saints, as they themselves recognised, was derived from that of the Church and was its effect and manifestation. They alone, in the most complete way, belonged entirely to the Church: they and all of us receive the Holy Spirit only through and in the Church, especially by the Sacraments.

The Spirit of unity and holiness is the Spirit of truth too. His teaching function was emphasised by our Lord at the Last Supper. It is thanks to his presence that the Church's teaching is infallible, whether expressed through the councils with the Pope at their head; through the Pope alone defining, for example, the dogma of the Assumption; or through the ordinary *Magisterium* of the Church. At the Council of Jerusalem, and before, the Apostles taught with divine authority: 'it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us'—and thanks to the guidance of the Spirit, the Church has kept inviolate the deposit of faith and interpreted it infallibly. These characteristics are not only of the past, but of the present and the future as well. 'The Holy Spirit who guided the Apostles is the same who still guides the Church, and speaks by the voice of the modern Popes. The path to which it commits us is the only safe one: To follow it is neither naïveté nor syncretism nor liberalism: it is simply Catholicism' (P. de Lubac: *Catholicism*, p. 156).

In their efforts to make clear the intimate nature of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, some Fathers call him, as we have seen, the Soul of the Church. Certain theologians, seeing the Church, like Bossuet did, as 'Jesus poured forth and communicated', call the Holy Spirit the Personality of the Church, i.e. the subsisting principle which exercises in the Mystical Body a role analogous to that of the divine person of the Word in the humanity of Christ.

So the Church is the type and model of the individual soul, but here also the parallel is not complete, for an individual who falls into mortal sin loses the supernatural presence of the Holy Spirit, while the Spirit's union with the

Church is indefectible and indissoluble. Although these comparisons are helpful as far as they go, Pius XII reminds us that 'we are dealing with a hidden mystery which during our exile on earth can never be completely unveiled.'

The most important principle of continuity in the Church is the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. He makes the Church of today one and the same with the Church of Pentecost. On that day he manifested his presence by the parted tongues of fire, the rushing wind and the gift of tongues. His coming took place in broad daylight in the capital of the Holy Land in a way that was manifest to the representatives of so many nations.

But although certain of the more spectacular charismata, given with unprecedented abundance in the early Church, have passed away, others still remain, as does the 'more excellent way' of charity, which also 'was diffused in our hearts through the Holy Spirit'. And the Church of today 'because of her wonderful propagation, her outstanding sanctity and inexhaustible fecundity in all good, her Catholic unity and unconquered stability is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an unshakable testimony to her divine mission'. (Vatican Council.)

The organisation of the Church also still remains recognisably the same as at Pentecost, in spite of the modifications of the history of 1,900 years. It is no coincidence that the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, which show so evidently the activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church, are also all-important for the Primacy of St Peter. The juridical and spiritual elements in the Church, so far from being incompatible, 'are complementary and perfect each other, like body and soul in us, both having their origin in one and the same Saviour, who not only said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" but also "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" and again "He that heareth you, heareth me".'

Essentially visible and essentially spiritual, the Church shows forth both these elements now as at Pentecost, the feast of the Spirit in the Bride. Hence the Mystery of Christ's Church may be epitomised by connecting a text of St Irenaeus with one of St Ambrose:

Ubi Spiritus ibi Ecclesia: ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.

TEMPTATIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH*

HENRI DE LUBAC, S.J.

THE Church of Christ is our mother: the true mother of the living. It is through her that we have life, it is she who nourishes life within us, it is she who gives us access to the living God. None the less, concerning this Mother for whom we should have only love, how many temptations beset us! Some of them are fierce, yet recognisable; others are obscure, hence more insidious. Some temptations are perennial and others are peculiar to our age. They are too many-faced, indeed, even mutually contradictory, to allow any of us to feel safe from their threat.

There will always be some individuals who perfectly identify their own cause with that of the Church and end by subordinating, in good faith, the Church's cause to their own. In their desire to serve the Church they actually put her to work for themselves: 'a dialectical turn about', which changes friend into foe, and takes place with as much ease as subtlety. For them the Church is, in fact, a certain familiar social order to which they belong. She is a certain state of civilisation, a definite number of principles, a certain ensemble of values which her influence has more or less made Christian, but which for all that, remains for the most part still human. Whatever disturbs this order or endangers this equilibrium, whatever upsets or merely startles these men, appears to them as an attack upon a divine institution. In such confused thinking, it is not always a case of the usual forms of clericalism which would judge the honour accorded to God by the benefits bestowed upon his ministers, or which would measure the advance of the divine government over souls and the reign of Jesus Christ in society according to the influence, direct or indirect, of the clergy upon secular affairs.

One can acquire this state of mind from the most honourable motives. The great Bossuet, for example, during his

**Revue de d'Action Populaire*, August-October, 1952, pp. 481-97.

Translated from the French by Neil G. McCluskey, S.J.

declining years had the entire Catholic order meshed to the temporal order of Louis XIV, and saw only peril for religion in the mingled forces which were beginning to break up a synthesis, truly brilliant but questionable in many of its components, contingent to be sure, and in essence doomed to perish. Against this break-up Bossuet struggled with all his might.

The old bishop was not only an intrepid warrior, he was a shrewd one—but not consistently. As Molien describes him: 'Along with his imperious will he possessed a naturally timid mind'. He would have liked to maintain for ever—reserving the right to attack certain abuses vigorously—the mental and social world within which his genius could roam. Bossuet thought that the faith could survive only within that world: like the old Romans, among them some Fathers of the Church, to whom the crash of the empire could mean only the end of the world. But in dreaming his impossible dreams, he was compromising the Church with that world already stricken mortally—the Church which had to shake herself free from such entanglement so as to bear life to other generations of men. In his impotent efforts to stem the tide of history, whose flow he deemed evil, he was banking up angry waters bearing the seeds of the future. At every level of society where he applied his stop-gap strategy, he was apparently successful; but in such wise that the force which emerged triumphant was irreligion.

So it can happen that we become all the more self-assured and stubborn in our judgments in that the cause we are defending is the more mixed. Though we realise it in theory, perhaps there are times when we actually forget, in our eagerness to impose our ideas and our personal tastes upon others, that inflexibility in one's faith does not mean a fanatical rigidity, that calcifying obduracy betrays the supple firmness of the truth, instead of safeguarding it; that a Christianity which deliberately and completely shelters itself behind barricades, disclaiming all advance and assimilation, would no longer be Christianity; that a sincere attachment to the Church cannot serve to canonise our prejudices, nor make our personal bias share in the absolute of a faith which is universal. It would, then, perhaps be of some value

to remember that a certain confidence and a certain detachment are part and parcel of the Catholic mind. Although she is deeply rooted in history, the Church is in bondage to no dimension of time, nor to anything whose essence is temporal. She is not founded upon any other base than that of Peter's faith which is faith in Christ Jesus. Moreover, she is not a faction. Among flesh-and-blood humans, who all are her children, at least virtually, she desires not the least adversary. Her wish is to free them all from every kind of evil while giving them to their Redeemer.

Let us, then, make our own her sentiments which are those of Jesus Christ. For this purpose we should, if need be, impose upon ourselves the necessary self-discipline. Let us relax not a whit in our zeal for the Catholic truth but let us learn to purify this zeal. Let self be suspect. We should dread a certain form of humility which is akin to pride itself. We should be fearful of sacrilege in usurping the truth. Let us take from St Augustine the words he addressed to his fellow crusaders at the height of the struggle against the Donatists: 'Be bold in fighting for the truth, but without haughtiness'.¹ And following Newman's example, instead of conducting ourselves as if the Church were our private domain and property, and more or less making the Church one with ourselves, let us eliminate the selfish element and labour to make ourselves one with the Church.

Beyond doubt, the contrary temptation is more frequent today; in any event, it is more evident and often more startling because of all that it stirs up. What is it? Briefly: the temptation to criticise. This temptation, too, can insinuate itself under the guise of good. It readily presents itself to the apostolic soul as an indispensable concern for clarity. Often it would not be detected except for a previous exercise in the 'discernment of spirits'.

The very word *critique* means 'discernment'. There does then exist a critique, and especially an 'auto-critique', as it is currently called, which is an excellent thing. It is an effort at realism in action. It is the decision to renounce completely whatever cannot be justified as authentic. It is an exam-

¹ *Contra Litteras Pelibiani*, I, i, 11.

ination of conscience humbly made, in knowing how to recognise the good one accomplishes but likewise motivated by an apostolic unrest and a spiritual urgency which is ever alert. A dissatisfaction with work accomplished, an ardent desire for improvement, honesty shown in one's judgment concerning techniques, independence shown in the desire to break with customs not justified and to remedy abuses, and far above everything else, an exalted idea of the Christian vocation and faith in the Church's mission—these are some of the attitudes from which 'auto-criticism' proceeds and which provide nourishment for it. It calls forth then a redoubled activity, a spirit of enterprise, research and experiment which, no doubt, at times must be kept in check and which often jars rather excessively the even tenor of our ways. Although it is severe with the illusions which it ferrets out, the auto-critique can become complacent with other illusions which will soon make of it, too, subject matter for a similar critique. Yet how much better this would be than the naïve self-complacency which permits no reform, no salutary transformation. How much less dangerous than a certain self-satisfaction which little by little walls itself up in a dream-world.

It would be wrong to desire, on principle, the suppression of all publicly expressed criticism. When the Church is humble in her children, she is more attractive than when a too human anxiety for respectability is predominant in them. Jacques Maritain once made the remark, not without a just nuance of raillery, that to many modern Christians every avowal of our shortcomings seems 'somehow indecent'. 'One could say', he added, 'that they dread the trouble they will cause the apologetes by such an admission. . . . The ancient Jews and even the Ninivites were not so squeamish.'² And the saints of past centuries still less so. One has only to reread, for instance, the famous address of St Jerome to Pope Damasus, the diatribes of St Bernard against evil shepherds and his programme of reform outlined in the *De Consideratione*, or an indictment such as St Catherine of Siena enunciated against certain high dignitaries in the Church: 'O men, no not really men, but rather devils in

² *De Règime Temporal*.

human form, how you are blinded by the deranged love you bear for the corruption of the body, for the pleasures and plaudits of the world!’³

Recall to mind St Bridget, Gerson, St Bernardine of Siena, St Thomas More, and more close to our own time, St Clement Hoffbauer. Let one reflect on the struggles of Pope Gregory VII and his successors to detach the government of the Church from the system which had enslaved it; the fearlessness of a Gerson of Reichersberg addressing to high places, as did St Bernard to Pope Eugene III, his work ‘*On the Corrupt State of the Church*’, the boldness of a William Durandus in publishing his treatise ‘*De Modo Concilii Celebrandi et Corruptelis in Ecclesia Reformandis*’, or again of the Carthusian monk, Pierre of Leyde, begging the Roman Pontiff to undertake the task of reform in the preface to the edition, which he published in 1530, of the works of his confrère, Denis the Carthusian.

These latter examples should serve to remind us of the whole of the great Catholic reform movement, rather inadequately designated under the name ‘counter-reform’. Such a task could not have been undertaken without the practical resolution to make use of the ‘auto-critique’ and of this procedure history has recorded more than one outstanding example.

Nevertheless, for every worthwhile complaint or clear profitable examination, there are many excesses! How frequent a lack of temperance! For each resolute act how much fruitless agitation! Sanctity is not a common phenomenon, and the most sincere good will cannot claim either the same rights or the same privileges. Competence and timeliness can also be wanting in our criticisms. Even if a charge be true, one is not always for that reason justified in making it. We must recognise also, and this remark is important, that today’s conditions are no longer those which existed in the centuries we call Christian. Everything took place then, if we can use the expression, within the family circle. The forces of irreligion were not continually poised to turn everything into matter for controversy. Today when the Church is forced to stand as the accused before the

³ Letter 315.

world's gaze, today when she is misunderstood, when her existence and even her holiness have become objects of scorn, every Catholic should be circumspect in not allowing to be exploited against her, words that he wanted to express only with a mind to serving her better. He should take care not to occasion mortal misunderstandings. This is a son's sense of delicacy, completely other than the approach of the prude or the pharisee. No cut-and-dried rule can here be laid down. However, toward the man who is really one with the Church, such as we have already tried to depict, toward this man who alone is the truly spiritual type, the Holy Spirit will not be niggardly with his gift of counsel.

In any event we should separate carefully all that would be pointless complaining, all that would stem from the loss, or even weakening of trust in the Church, from healthy auto-criticism, even that which is clumsily or excessively made. It would be impious to disparage, under pretext furnished by certain *faux pas*, 'all that praiseworthy, silent work of contemporary Christianity which makes an issue of its shortcomings, seeks to understand, love and preserve the values which arise outside its direct influence, and hurries into the storm to start assembling basic materials for a new structure'.⁴ In order, however, that such an effort be consistent and profitable, one must be alert not to let it be poisoned by the breath of any other inspiration than that which it had at its genesis.

At certain times one observes symptoms of an evil multiplying and spreading like an epidemic. This is a fit of collective neurasthenia. For those who are afflicted, everything becomes matter for disparagement. It is not only a case of giving vent to irony, opposition, or bitterness from which, in every age, certain characters cannot abstain. But everything takes on a pejorative meaning. Every hint of evil, even when true, increases the malady. The life of the spirit begins to grow faint, so much so that nothing is henceforth seen in its true perspective: one imagines himself all-discerning and can no longer discern the essential. To evaluate things in the spirit of faith now seems an illusion. Then, in a thousand ways, discouragement creeps in. What could have

⁴ Mounier: *Un surnaturalisme historique*, p. 113.

occasioned a leap forward has now for its effect only paralysis. Sincere faith can still be present but it is hollowed out on all sides. One begins to look upon the Church with the eyes of a stranger in order to sit in judgment upon her. The holy groaning of the Spirit in prayer now has become purely human grumbling. By this pharisaic process, a kind of interior secession which is not yet an open break but still deadly, one has already put his foot along a path which can lead to full apostasy.

Would that one could wake to his condition in time and take immediate countermeasures! It is not a question of blinding one's self to all sorts of shortcomings, too real for such pretence. It is no question of not being pained by them. A total and fervent loyalty in our allegiance does not demand on our part a puerile admiration for all that can exist or be thought of or take place within the Church. This Bride of Christ whom her Spouse desired to be perfect, holy and immaculate, is such only in her principle. If she shines with a spotless brilliance it is as Pope Pius XII wrote:

The loving Mother is spotless in the sacraments, by which she gives birth to her children and nourishes them, she is spotless in the faith, which she has preserved inviolate always, in her sacred laws imposed on all, in the evangelical counsels which she recommends, in those heavenly gifts and extraordinary graces through which, with inexhaustible fecundity, she generates a host of martyrs, virgins and confessors.⁵

If her soul is the Spirit of Christ, she is none the less made up of human beings. And as we well know, men have never attained the heights of the divine mission which has been entrusted to them. Never have they been completely malleable and docile to the inspirations of the Holy Spirit. If men are not successful in corrupting the Church because the source of her sanctifying strength is not from them, she is no more successful, while their earthly state endures, in drying up in them the opposing wellspring of corruption. The better among them unceasingly set up a thousand obstacles to thwart the good that God could work through them. We should understand thoroughly, then, and in

⁵ *Mystici Corporis*.

advance—and here history is a sound pedagogue—that nothing which stems from man's heart should ever disconcert us.

But which of us is not a member of the human family? Is not each of us aware of his own misery and lack of ability? Is it not an open contradiction for a man to serve a holy cause with questionable means? Should not such a one say to himself that the most serious faults are the ones which escape notice? Has he not just a faint realisation, or only a glimpse of the fact, that he is unable to understand the mystery to which his life is dedicated? Why, then, at that stage, think of separating ourselves from the flock? Why this secession which is what a man does when he sets himself up to judge others? We fall thus into the same illusion as the misanthrope who takes a dislike to the human race, as if he belonged to some other species, while 'in order to realise our basic identity with humanity, all we need do is to be a part of it, to adhere to the whole mass, and to mingle with all its members'. Then 'our grievances, our schism, our role of judge, our odious comparisons all vanish'.⁶ Then the evident contrast existing between the human misery of all who make up the Church and the grandeur of her divine mission, hard-won knowledge gained first from our own experience, will no longer scandalise us. It will be rather a spur forward. We shall understand that a certain 'auto-critique', completely aimed at the world outside of ourselves, would only be a subterfuge for shunning the duty of examining our own consciences. The humble acceptance of Catholic solidarity will make us perhaps love anew, in a new light, that very part of our Church's wisdom, of her institutions and traditions and exigencies which we had difficulty in comprehending.

Today, however, discontent often takes more precise forms in order to gnaw at the soul. An apostle, the most humble one, doesn't escape them. He begins to wonder in anguish if the Church's activity is really adapted to our times. Does not our experience, worthy of respect, show that she is tragically ineffective? During the past few years in particular such question have been posed everywhere. Let

⁶ Paul Claudel.

us not fool ourselves in regard to their seriousness. We should not dismiss them too speedily by a refusal to face them. We should be only adding to the difficulties of those persons who, perhaps because they are less lethargic than we, toss restlessly throughout the night through concern for these problems. But here, too, we must force ourselves, without going to extremes, to practise the 'discernment of spirits'.

One is inclined, then, to ask himself about the present value, not of course of Christianity itself, but about many of the elements which make up, as it were, the ancient religious machinery, such as the centuries have moulded it. He decides that the yield is too paltry. He declares that the mechanism is worn out, that the mainsprings are loose. He gauges its lack of adaptability. He charges it with being in a rut. It would hardly be astonishing if there were found in such a battery of accusations several traces of extremism, nor would it surprise anybody if, in the diagnosis of evil as well as in the choice of remedy, a few errors were to slip in. A keen intuition for new requirements can be the companion of a study which is too cavalier and fanciful. There is no need to take undue alarm. If the inspiration is honest, one will have no difficulty in rectifying what needs to be changed, or in correcting a lopsided effort with the necessary counter-balance.

But it is precisely this inspiration which must be watched. The worst inspiration can go hand-in-hand with the best. It can cleverly introduce itself in the garb of good. What is the real source of this hunger for adaptation, or what amounts to the same thing, the real origin of the need felt of what is called a more efficacious 'incarnation?'—a solicitude, in itself very proper? Is it purely an overflow of charity, akin to that of St Paul, who in his pursuit of Jesus Christ, wished to become all things to all men? Is not this an admixture of that illusion—overly natural to this professional critic who inevitably edges close to the role of the priest—that a change of method is all that is needed, just as in purely human enterprises, to obtain results which before all else supposes a change of heart? Realistic views, objective investigations, formulation of 'sociological laws', the

preparation of elaborate plans, departures big and little from the apostolic methods of the past, the designing of brand-new techniques: an unalloyed and scrupulously proper zeal can make use of all these means, and he who would sneer at them can himself be too readily assuming the hero's role in holding them up derisively, in opposition to the means of a Curé of Ars. Yet necessarily, we must ever keep in their proper rack the tools we intend for the exclusive service of the Holy Spirit.

Still more serious is another point, which in more or less subtle doses is mingled with our discontent: a kind of fearfulness, a lack of deep-rooted conviction, a secret disgust with the tradition of the Church. In yielding to this, would we not be setting ourselves up as judges of this tradition, according to superficially 'modern' criteria? Would not this mean that the mundane values of the world paraded before our eyes had begun to dazzle us? Would we not gradually be permitting ourselves to shrink into the shell of an inferiority complex in the presence of those who proclaim such values? Regarding matters which should be most sacred to us, would we not be in a fair way to thinking according to the same pattern which belong to the type of man whose blindness we should be lamenting? Would we not be foolishly allowing ourselves to be impressed by the pomp of the pride of life? In brief, while remaining unswerving in the faith itself, would we not be beginning, so to speak, to let our faith in the Church's tradition swerve?

This would be the moment to recall more explicitly certain eternal truths. 'When I shall be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all things to myself.' It is clear that these words of Jesus are not intended as a description of what should be our tactics for spreading his gospel. St Paul, crucified to the cross with Christ, roamed the wide world, the prototype of a legion of apostles, and the Church will ever remain a missionary Church. Still Christ's words indicate to us the proper frame of mind. In other words, we are right in desiring not to be 'separated' from men, when it is a question of leading them to Christ, if by that we understand that we must lift the barriers which certain obsolete forms of life and thought would put between them and

us, *a fortiori* practices which only a life of indolence can justify. We are right in not consenting to let ourselves be shut up in any sort of ghetto erected either by ourselves or by others. But we must take equal care not to misunderstand the condition essential to those who are set 'apart' which relative to this world is the lot of every Christian and much more every priest. (*Sanctus = segregatus.*) If the world see us truly alive in our sanctified withdrawal from it as well as in our keen scrutiny of all that such a dedication entails, there will be no lack of others who will be drawn by this manner of life, and will no longer want to be separated from us. And by our means the miracle of the attraction of Christ will be perpetuated.

Let us not be afraid, then, to sympathise profoundly with the feelings of our fellow men. Let us be completely human: a sincere conscience plus fraternal charity oblige us to it; or, to put it better, such a disposition should be so natural, so congenital, that we should not have to labour at it. We should not assume an attitude which confuses fidelity to the eternal with a meaningless, even morbid, attachment to the past. At the same time, however, let us be cautious of the twentieth century's all-sufficiency. We should be careful not to make our own the weaknesses, the fads and the narrow-mindedness of our milieu. We do well to guard against opening the door to worldliness—be it of the poor or the rich, of the vulgar or the refined. Or rather—for unhappily we always share in some measure in it—we must not cease disentangling ourselves from it. Briefly, we should always be ready to adapt ourselves and as spontaneously as possible: but without ever allowing the principles of Christianity itself, in our behaviour or thought, to be adapted, that is, made purely human or in the slightest degree debased. Let us love our century but without succumbing to the spirit of the century. May the salt of the gospel never become unsavoury in us!

[*To be concluded*]

PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION

S. M. ALBERT, O.P.

THE Mass is both sacrifice and sacrament. As sacrifice it consists principally in man's activity, Christ's and ours, inspired and aided by grace, and of God's approval and acceptance of what we do. Christ as man and Head of his Mystical Body represents that sacrifice of himself and us in him which he offered on Calvary. We his members endorse and ratify this, associating our own offering with his. It is in Christ's name as well as his own that the priest says: 'Brethren, pray that *my sacrifice and yours* may be acceptable to God'. And God's reply is to receive and accept this offering as if saying once more: 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased'.

It is needful to be quite clear about the nature of our activity. The priest says words and makes gestures which are essential to the offering of the sacrifice. There would be no Mass without them. But though essential, they are not its essence. In our case, they are not even essential. Actually we do express our association with the action of the priest by gestures and movements: standing, kneeling, bowing, making the sign of the Cross and the like. Ideally the congregation should also have its allotted prayers and responses which would not be repeated by the priest. But it would be possible to do all that and still to remain aloof from the real action, to have no part in Christ's sacrifice. The Mass is Calvary made present in our midst. Christ on Calvary said little and did nothing external save surrender himself unresistingly to the violence of his executioners and hang until he died on the cross to which they had nailed him. Mary who represented us spoke not a word. Her standing by the cross was the only outward expression of an interior identification with her Son's offering that it is beyond our powers to conceive. The heart of the sacrifice of Calvary, which is also the heart of the Mass, is Christ's utter surrender to the Father's will, expressed through obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. On Calvary the outward expression of this inner act took one form, in the Mass it has another.

Words and gestures are now the means whereby Christ's offering is made present and our association with it is proclaimed. But blind, dumb, paralysed, afar off, we can still be one with Christ in the Mass, vitally active offering and offered, by a single act of the will. 'Charity keeps you from the altar, but unites you to the sacrifice', wrote Fr Vincent McNabb, O.P., to a nurse who was unable to get to church.

Then God accepts Christ's offering and ours, and taking the bread and wine which symbolises them, he transforms it and the sacrifice becomes sacramental. The emphasis begins to change. God takes over, as it were, and it is our turn to receive, accept, 'endure'—unfortunately we have no word which adequately describes the '*pati*' in the mystical sense. The Sacred Humanity acts now not as man's mouthpiece but as God's instrument. Christ has taken man to God in the movement of his self-offering, now he brings God to man in the encounter of Holy Communion. First our gifts were transformed into Christ's Body and Blood, now they are given back to effect a spiritual transformation in us. He comes as the life of our souls, the food whereby that life is sustained; the mind is filled with grace and a pledge of future glory is given. He inflames us with the fire of that love which burns in his own Heart and, by uniting each one of us to himself, binds in a closer union all the members of his Mystical Body.

All this is the culmination, the necessary completion of the Mass. It is the climax to which all the other Sacraments and even the Sacrifice of the Mass itself are directed, the climax, that is, on earth, one might say, of the whole economy of the Incarnation; though turning to heaven, Christ looks to restore to the Father what man had attempted to wrest from him. He has come that we may have life and have it more abundantly, and here is that life become the life of our souls, here is the supreme means by which it is made available to us. This sacramental union is at once the symbol and means of that spiritual marriage of Christ with his Church, and of the Blessed Trinity with each individual creature of which heaven is only the glorious consummation and perfection. Holy Communion is necessary for the integrity of the Mass, just as it is in a sense necessary for salva-

tion. That is why the priest *must* communicate at every Mass and why the faithful are strongly urged to do so.

Holy Communion might therefore be described as the most favourable opportunity for God's action on our souls. Yet it depends on us in two ways. First we must give him this opportunity by receiving the Sacrament. He begs, invites, commands us to come. Come and eat, come and drink, come and be refreshed and strengthened. Notice that he never says: come and adore. The love and worship with which the Blessed Sacrament has come to be surrounded is a good and wholesome thing. It is right and fitting that our Emmanuel should receive the honour which is his due, that this Lover of souls should be shown gratitude and appreciation and affection by those for whose sake he is here: fitting, too, that all this should be done in reparation for the many slights and insults and blasphemies which he has to endure. But all this is secondary and the tendency to overstress it may come from a faulty conception of the whole theology of the Incarnation. The Creed says quite definitely: '*Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was made man*'. That purpose remains the same. Christ becomes present on our altar, in our souls, for the same reason as he was born in the stable at Bethlehem and hung on the cross at Calvary: for our sake, not for his. He went around the towns and villages of Palestine seeking, not to receive, but to give, to give to all who would come and receive. No one was to be turned away, not even the little children who were too small to benefit from his teaching and whom the apostles thought would be rather a nuisance to the Master. He has not changed. Jesus Christ yesterday, today and the same forever. For centuries men were kept away from Holy Communion on the pretence that they were not fit or worthy enough to receive It frequently. Did those who propounded this theory ever stop to think of the presumption implied: viz. that anyone could at any time be really fit or worthy for such a privilege? God didn't become man because man deserved it but because he needed it. And so at last, through the voice of Blessed Pius X, our Lord cried out once more: If *any man* thirst, let him come to me and drink. No one able to benefit from Holy Communion

was to be kept away: the use of reason, a state of grace, the correct dispositions—of which more will be said in a moment—that was all that was required. Is there anything that I could have done for my vineyard that I have not done? Some of the invited guests found obstacles or excuses in the Church's fasting laws, fashioned long ago in the interests of reverence and decorum. These, too, then must give way before Christ's longing desire to be with the children of men. So he speaks again through our own Holy Father, and once more man's need and not any accidental honour given to God is shown to be the primary purpose of the Holy Eucharist. He has made it so easy, almost too easy some might think, for us to come to him. Is no effort, no sacrifice, to be asked of us in return for this privilege which is the fruit of his sacrifice on the cross?

Here we return to the question of those 'proper dispositions' of which Blessed Pius made mention in his decree and to which perhaps too little attention has been paid—a neglect which may perhaps explain why frequent Communion does not always produce the effects one would expect. Although our Lord is the chief agent in Holy Communion, so that it is what he does in our souls and not what we say to him that really matters, yet it is not enough for us to give him his opportunity by receiving him in Holy Communion. We must further see to it, so far as in us lies, that there are no obstacles placed in the way of his activity; like John the Baptist, we must prepare the way of the Lord. In what, then, does this preparation, far more important than our thanksgiving, consist? From some of the pious manuals one might get the impression that it means chiefly preparing triumphal arches and illuminated addresses, strewing flowers and presenting bouquets. Is that what he wants from us? Once more the Gospels supply the answer. Only once while on earth did Christ allow himself to be fêted—on Palm Sunday—and the proceedings ended in a sad anti-climax. Usually he fled from such demonstrations, as when the crowd tried to make him king after the multiplication of the loaves. When he went out to dine, he appreciated special marks of honour such as the anointings (though was not this because of the inner love which inspired them?), and when the ordinary

courtesies shown to any guest were denied him, he drew attention to the omission. But he was quite ready to walk in unannounced as he did to Zaccheus; and Martha's overfussiness about entertaining him did not meet with the approval she expected. He was at ease anywhere, but humanly speaking he must surely have been more at home in Peter's fisherman's cottage than in the banqueting hall of the wealthy Pharisees.

Once more we need to remind ourselves that he has not changed. The only courtesy which he insists on is freedom from grave sin, since that is a state of enmity wholly incompatible with communion, hatred quite opposed to the love he comes to inflame. He does not come because he seeks entertainment but because we need his help, as did the blind, the lame, the deaf, the lepers, the paralysed, the possessed of Israel. These did not hide their diseases or put on a false show of health. Rather did they parade their miseries, the better to arouse his sympathy and compassion. Conscious of and confessing their need, they were equally confident in his power to succour it. Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me whole. Lord, I am not worthy . . . but only say the word and my servant shall be healed. By using this prayer and pointing out our Lord as the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world immediately before administering Holy Communion, the Church leaves no room for doubt as to the dispositions in which she wishes us to receive It. In one of the prayers of preparation for Mass St Thomas expresses them at greater length. 'I come sick to the physician of life: unclean, to the fountain of mercy: blind, to the light of eternal brightness: poor and needy, to the Lord of heaven and earth. . . . Therefore do I ask thee to heal my sickness; clothe my nakedness; wash away my uncleanness; enrich my poverty; and clothe my nakedness; so that I may receive the Bread of angels . . . with such reverence and humility, such sorrow and love, such purity and faith, such purpose and intent as shall further my soul's salvation.' Selfish though it might sound, our soul's salvation is the reason for receiving this bread of angels, and it is to further this that we ask our Lord to prepare our souls and produce the virtues which we need.

The humility to admit our misery and to seek its cure, the realisation that even our best efforts can help us little but that he can and will do all that is required; these are the basic dispositions which prepare us to profit to the full from Christ's Eucharistic action. But we need, too, in order to receive the fullness of this grace, to be supple and pliable, offering no resistance to the movement of his grace. This means the repudiation of all deliberate venial sin and even imperfections, the freeing of both mind and will of all attachment to everything save the will of God. If Christ is to transform us into himself, the mind must be free to be possessed by his Spirit of Truth, the will to be inflamed by his Spirit of Love. All pride and ambition and self-seeking, all attachment to our own ideas, everything which tends to put self in the place of God; then every form of selfishness and uncharitableness which puts self before one's fellow-men—these things are the great obstacles to the Christ-life in our souls and therefore their removal, so far as in us lies, is the best remote preparation for Holy Communion.

Our ancestors often spent three days in preparation and thanksgiving for their rare Communions. Their fervour and reverence must surely have pleased their Lord, yet he seeks something other of us. If our daily or weekly sacramental union with him is, as it should be, the high spot in our lives, then instinctively during the day our thoughts and longing will often turn to him as to an eagerly expected lover, and this remembrance together with the desire to please him which it will certainly inspire, will do much towards preparing us for his coming. The longing for union will produce a readiness to do and endure anything which will help to remove the obstacles which keep us at a distance and deny him full freedom of action. Then in the Mass, the Holy Spirit prepares our minds and hearts by the instructions and prayers which suggest the appropriate attitude and arouse fitting desires. All these are summed up and swallowed up in the complete surrender of all we have and are and have been and would like to be, which we make by willingly associating ourselves with Christ's sacrifice, placing ourselves as it were on the paten and in the chalice, as docile and unresisting under the action of God as are the bread and

wine in the hands of the priest. After such a surrender, even if only in desire, we can confidently leave the rest to God. Christ, when he comes, has a free hand. Deliberate restraints on his action there are none, and such as exist because of our inevitable weakness and sinfulness his love will gradually purge away—that is one of the effects proper to this sacrament. If he wants our acts and aspirations he will show us. If he holds us unfeeling and unseeing in the darkness of faith, there is nothing to fear. When the lover asks from the beloved only an unresisting surrender to his embrace there is nothing more that she can give. Mary's *Fiat mihi* at the Annunciation, his own *Pater in manus tuas* on the cross, are the unchanging pattern for man's highest response to the wooing of his God. Simple it may sound, easy it is not. Yet it includes all and he is satisfied with nothing less.

For many centuries the fullness of union with God on earth which the mystics describe in terms of the Spiritual Marriage was considered too exalted and the purifications which must precede it too terrible for it to be within the reach of any save a privileged élite. During that same period frequent Communion also was confined to a select few. The return almost in our own day to the belief that all are called to holiness and that the fullness of contemplation should be the normal flowering of the life of grace, has coincided with a revival of the primitive practice of frequent and daily Communion. Would it be legitimate to see more than mere coincidence here? The bliss of heaven is the joy flowing from the vision of God in the Word, but it is reached only through incorporation in the Word made Flesh. Union with the Blessed Trinity is the perfection of the life of the spirit, but the Sacred Humanity is the instrument by which it is fashioned, and It is physically present with us in the Holy Eucharist. Holy Communion is not the end, but it symbolises that end to which it is the surest and most effective means. But can one hope to attain to the end if the proper means are neglected, to reach the goal if the way is barred? And conversely, when the means are placed so freely at our disposal and Christ through his Vicar pleads with us to make use of them, is it not because he longs so earnestly for the fulfilment of the end: that they may be made perfect in one?

FATHER STEUART, S.J. 1874-1948

E. ROBERTS AND K. KENDALL

IN the following issues of *THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT* there will appear a series of Fr Steuart's 'Meditations' on the *Our Father* given as closely as possible in the same words as they came from his vital and magnetic personality. The *Our Father* was his favourite topic, and indeed it must be so for us all. One of the greatest questions addressed to Christ by his apostles was 'Teach us to pray', and one imagines the whole world waiting in intense expectancy for the divine answer. And it comes: 'Thus shall ye pray, "Our Father".'

It was a maxim of Father Steuart's for young preachers that if they wished to succeed they must be in a white heat of desire to convey the truth they are teaching, and that this of itself would ensure both attention and response on the part of their hearers. Fr Steuart himself was a perfect example of this. He never embarked on a sermon or conference in an easy nonchalant sort of way, but always with that sense of responsibility, and even at times anxiety, which sprang from this sincerity and conviction.

For deep spiritual conviction was the characteristic of Fr Steuart's teaching. And this is in no way incompatible with the self-revelations quoted by Fr Martindale in his Memoir. In the intimacy of these private notes, Fr Steuart expresses in no measured terms the sense of failure and frustration he so often felt.

The notes are usually the results of self-examination following the making of a retreat. They are consistently gloomy, a depressing record. He wrote in 'a key of continuous lamentation' or of 'recurrent melancholy', as Fr Martindale says. He was a failure in the Society, in everything he set himself to do. 'I *am* the cold, negligent, unspiritual, worldly, self-indulgent, idle, prayerless priest that I thought it possible—barely possible—that I might become.' This was written at Stonyhurst in 1913, and it is significant that two years later he emerged as an army chaplain of whose courage and devotedness everyone spoke the highest things.

About the time that he was appointed Superior at Oxford, December 1921, there is another burst of self-condemnation. 'My weak, inconstant, ease-loving, muddle-headed, extravagant nature unfits me completely for the charge of anything.' Yet this was the period when, according to those who knew him well at the time, he was to begin that deeper spiritual growth which fitted him for his finest work of dealing with souls in retreats and in direction.

In 1924 he writes 'with shame' because people have begun to have a good opinion of him whilst he thinks of himself as 'without principles, virtues, strength, courage, honesty', and much more: a comprehensive catalogue of shortcomings, failures, sins, with no ray of light or hope to be found in it. Yet in 1926 he began, during his nine years as Superior at Farm Street, what are generally acknowledged to be the most fertile, fruitful years of his life.

How then is it possible to reconcile Fr Steuart's strong spiritual convictions, his ever-recurrent theme of God's love for *me*, together with the success of his apostolate, and this other side of deep gloom amounting almost to despair?

Yet was it not this alternating experience of darkness and light, of despair and hope which made him a master director of souls, one who knows at first hand the weakness of human nature, and who has learned through this very knowledge to cling to God?

In a conference given to Religious we find Fr Steuart himself throwing light on the problem. 'I am afraid', he said, 'when I think of the account I may have to render. Why do I not do what I was called to do?'

'Then on the other hand I am comforted because I see that our Lord has entered into every detail of human experience. He allowed himself to go to the very edge of human despair; he allowed himself to feel the sensation of fear. He permitted it, so that even in our fear we see that God is with us. It may be perhaps that the sort of suffering we are going to be called to is personal fear and terror at our own failure and inadequacy.'

He is aware that 'the Christ-life in us always expresses itself in pain. Not because there is any as it were "chemical" virtue in pain itself, but that the life of union with God,

which is the Christ-life, is proved by his human history to mean inexorably that we must suffer as he had to. When one sees this and bravely accepts it, it becomes paradoxically sweet to us, though none the less "hateful".'

The reviewer of *The Two Voices* in THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT makes an interesting suggestion:

'In reading this memoir one may be led to question whether the Ignatian system was quite suitable to this Scot. It is possible that with a different sort of training the pre-occupation with the ideal of holiness which stands out as the impelling positive theme of the life of this great man would have borne fruit even more quickly and more abundantly.'

As against this opinion there are those who would emphatically reply that a character like Fr Steuart's needed all the discipline and self-searching of the Exercises and spirit of St Ignatius, not merely for his spiritual growth, but for the very safety of his soul.

Be that as it may, it is clear that Fr Steuart learned to draw largely for himself and for those whom he directed, not only from his Father, St Ignatius, but also from the Carmelite school.

As one might expect, the structure of his retreats was always based on the Exercises of St Ignatius. From them he drew valuable advice on prayer, especially in its early stages. His hearers during retreats were taught, for instance, the 'Second Method' as it is called, by which one dwells on each phrase of a prayer for as long as possible in peace and recollection.

Then later he would pass easily to the teaching of St John of the Cross, explaining the three signs given by this master of prayer for moving from discursive meditation to contemplation. One needs only to compare Fr Steuart's teaching with much of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* to see how deeply he had absorbed it. One almost hears the voice of St John of the Cross in the cry which seemed to come from the depth of Fr Steuart's own soul: 'How hard, how terrible, how almost unbearable is the way of the soul whom God leads through this illuminating obscurity, more and more into nothing, and nothing, and nothing'.

Hilda Graef, in her book *The Way of the Mystics*, com-

compares the two schools. She writes in reference to St Francis de Sales: 'It is the Dominican emphasis on the Divine action that penetrates, though not consciously, Teresian spirituality; it is the Jesuit stress on human co-operation that gives the Salesian doctrine its peculiarly "modern" flavour'.

If we accept this idea, we can see in studying Fr Steuart's writings and conferences that he drew from both. He almost despaired at not being able to rise to his ideal of co-operation with God, and in doing so, he soared in spite of himself into heights of confidence and hope. That was why he was so well able to instil this same confidence and hope into the most depressed of his penitents.

'People setting out on the spiritual life', he said, 'think what it is going to involve: a long frightening vista of mortification, self-denial, humility, charity. What a labour in the saints! What marvellous perseverance and courage and faith and hope had to be brought into play every instant of their lives; and I am discouraged and say "It can't be!" One has heard of people saying they wished they did not believe in God because it was torment to think how perfect they ought to be, and how frightfully difficult it was.

'And so, looking forward to growth in holiness, getting closer to God, I always have the idea that it is on my part, that I have got to labour for it, and that God is there but I have got to shorten the distance between us. Well, if instead I get this idea of God eagerly getting to me! If I think of Christ's idea of the Father, I know that God is labouring to get to me; and why he has to labour is because it is I who make the obstacles! "If only you'd 'be still' and let me come to you!", one can imagine God saying. . . . No one ever suggested that the Christian life was an easy one—that sanctity was easy to attain. The "Our Father" shows us the closeness and immeasurable love between us and God—God who loves us as a Father loves his children; who will not let us go; up to the limit of our free wills drawing us.'

It was this lesson of complete trust which he passed on to those he directed more perhaps than any other; it was this that lay at the root of his teaching on the *Our Father*, and of all his teaching; it was this that changed words of despair into words of sublime hope.

POINT OF VIEW

AS one who is living in the world, and at the same time trying to work out a Contemplative scheme of things, I should like to thank *Solitarius* for his Point of View, which appeared in the April issue.

The sense of spiritual and intellectual isolation is a very real factor. I can appreciate this view, living at home, with parents—the one indifferent, the other antagonistic about matters of faith. Trying to run a fairly large household, unaided, it is by no means easy to combine the daily domestic routine with a definite time each day set apart for prayer, meditation and study. The interruptions are many and varied—unexpected callers, tradespeople and the telephone are but a few; while meals for a hungry family cannot just be left to chance at any time. Often one has to break off in the middle of some absorbing thought in meditation to take up other duties that require all one's attention at either the stove or the sink!

Trying to combine the two lives is indeed something of a problem. It isn't any wonder that one does sometimes feel 'hemmed in all round' and the chances of escape are remote. There must be many who, like myself, find themselves 'Marthas by circumstance, but Marys by preference'. Trying to play their full part in the daily domestic life, while at the same time carrying in their hearts and inner being the thoughts and aspirations of Mary. . . .

Daily I grow more convinced that trying to lead the life of a contemplative *in* the world today requires as great an amount of spiritual courage and discipline as is asked of those who belong to Religious or enclosed communities.

All life is a battleground for Christ—and amid the difficulties I welcome the idea expressed by *Solitarius* of making these difficulties 'your desert and your cell'.

D.B.S.

WORKS ON OUR LADY

GERARD M. CORR, O.S.M.

This¹ is a devout thesis, 'in sensu composito', and is well worth reading and acting upon. Briefly, the author believes that he has hit upon a great truth in St John's gospel which hardly anyone seems to have adverted to, viz., that on Calvary the Beloved Disciple was entrusted to the care and guardianship of Mary not merely as the representative of the human race but as a priest: it was because he was a priest that he could adequately and properly be chosen to represent all mankind at the foot of the cross.

There is much more to say for this thesis than might appear at first glance. The author has marshalled many persuasive reasons and presented them forcefully. His style is rather alarming, with capitals and thick type and broken sentences strewn all over the pages, and one fears he would defend it as 'the psychology of the printed word' (he does go so far as to speak of the 'psychology of our Lord on the cross') but one soon gets used to this, and it has its advantages.

The authorities quoted in support are not very numerous and not very convincing, but that is in the nature of the case. At least one ends the book with a conviction that the abbé has made some good points, well worth developing.

The last quarter of the book is an attempt to show that the holy women who stood with our Lady and St John on Calvary are also, in their way, partakers of the Motherhood of Priests which is given to Mary, a thought less far-fetched than unexpected. Muted a little and adapted a little, this book might go very well in English and be very useful to priests.

In the preface to this handsome (though paper-covered) eighty-four-page help to meditation upon the rosary² (it is really sixty-four reproductions of Old Masters plus the meditative commentary) we have François Mauriac's idea of the rosary. He considers it a spiritually healthy, vaguely reflective pattern (even patter) of prayerful meditation, primarily helpful to the non-intellectual but extremely useful, perhaps even necessary, for the intellectual who is humble enough to use it. Compare this with Père Garrigou-Lagrange's firmer, more historical description. He maintains that St Dominic's inspired invention, or discovery, was the long sermon on the mysteries, relieved, punctuated, by many *Paters* and *Aves* recited while the great truths were consciously present to the mind: and that this became the rosary (cf. *Doctrine and Life*, Oct.-Nov., 1952, pp. 227-233). This suggests that the meditation should come first, and that the thought, realisa-

¹ *Le Prêtre confié à Marie et à ses filles*. By the abbé J.-M. Gally. (Editions du Leman; 260 fr.)

² *Le Rosaire*. By Père H.-D. Laval, O.P. (Editions d'Histoire et d'Art. Librairie Plon, Paris; 480 fr.)

tion, gleaned from it should be merely the background for straightforward *Paters, Aves, Glorias*. This way of looking at it helps us to cope with the objection that in the rosary we are saying one thing and thinking another. It is a question of fusing the two, meditation and vocal prayer, and the trouble is, too often, that we fail to supply the first element and the second becomes mechanical.

Père Laval's method is to supply the meditation with the help of pictures which cannot fail to hold the mind—at least the visual memory—and to suggest, with an imaginative, modern-phrased causerie, many word-pictures, impressions, glimpses of fresh meanings and applications. It is an excellent approach to what is called the modern mind, from which we all suffer.

Whoever chose Van der Goes for the illustrations of the joyful mysteries, and Barna for the sorrowful, and Tintoretto for the glorious, was inspired. But though they dominate the book Père Laval makes them serve his purpose; they do not degenerate into a picture gallery.

The text appears to me somewhat miracle-shy and faintly humanistic, but perhaps I have not thoroughly grasped Père Laval's method of approaching modern readers.

'How our Lady can form the daily lives of priests' is the general theme of this book.³ It has nothing to do with the 'priesthood' of Mary. The author is one of those too-rare writers who can be absolutely relied upon to say something interesting and illuminating. The translation does him less than justice.

Our Lady's rôle in the work and in the sanctification of priests is of primary importance. It deserves the serious consideration of all priests. Its theological foundation deserves close study. But one may question the wisdom of mixing theological terms and axioms with ordinary everyday phrases in an attempt to write devotional theology. In translation the result of such an attempt is apt to be, to put it mildly, surprising. For instance: '(Jesus) places in our hearts—but according to the degree of our love, so often alas! a mere flicker—all the *feelings* of his Heart on the Cross for his Father, for his Blessed Lady, for all men and also all the feelings he has, in Heaven, towards the souls for whose intentions the Mass is being celebrated'. (p. 40. My italics.) 'She (Mary) became his (St John's) Mother as she was until then the Mother of Jesus.' (p. 13.)

In spite of the inadequacy of the translation, Père Phillippe's ideas on Mary's mothering of a priest, as a priest, shine through; the intimate connection between Mary's motherhood and the priesthood of our Lord is well brought out, with the consequent consoling certainty of the special love which our Lady has for all priests.

³ *The Blessed Virgin and the Priesthood*. By Paul Philippe, O.P. (Mercier Press; 6s.)

REVIEWS

THE REINTEGRATION OF THE CHURCH. By Nicolas Zernov. (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.)

A book of 130 pages is not likely to exhaust the subject chosen by Professor Zernov. A review of 500 words will be even more incapable of commenting on such a book. If the following words therefore seem carping, it will not be for want of a deep appreciation of the right zeal of the Professor, but because this little book has had its fair share of praise and perhaps not enough criticism.

The title is a *petitio principii* and it is surprising to find it used for a book written by an Orthodox—which is presumably the form of Christianity native to the author. For the orthodox Orthodox the Church can no more be divided than it can be for a Catholic. The difference between them is: which half of the great split between East and West has remained the true Church? So we begin with an ambiguity. Is the Professor speaking for the Orthodox, or is he paddling his own canoe, as the phrase goes? That is the advantage of an *imprimatur*: It does not commit the Church to your views, but it does ensure that your views do not contradict in essentials the doctrine of the Church you represent, and the reader knows where he is.

After reading this little book it became clear to the reviewer how difficult it is to attempt to state your 'opponent's' point of view in these matters fairly. Should one rather make quite clear one's own? Scarcely any mention of the Catholic Church in these pages would be accepted as fair comment by even a most friendly Catholic. One wonders whether the author tried the device of showing the MS. to a Catholic. Thus the statement, 'It [i.e. the Roman Catholic Church] lacks some vital elements of Christian tradition which have been developed by those who remained outside the authority of the Pope' (p. 78), is a bald statement not enlarged upon. I think it false. It would be a interesting point to discuss in all friendliness. We are usually accused of having added too much.

The place of the Anglican Communion is put high in the matter of reunion. The author may be right, but it would be sad if the East for the sake of external unity abandoned their firm stand on the dogmatic basis of their Christian life. The Anglicans might have a solvent effect upon them.

If one starts with the assumption, as the author does, that the Church is split, splintered, then it is difficult to resolve the contradiction between the present state of affairs, as stated in those terms, and Christ's promise of, and his exhortation to, unity. But to say the Church is divided is only one way of looking at the difficulty. It is possible that Christians are divided but the Church not. It is as impossible for the Church to be divided as

it is for Christ to be divided; for the Church is the body of Christ, it is the Bride of Christ. Men can easily enough divide themselves from the Church. This is what has happened.

No educated Catholic would for a moment assert that the break away from unity, either in the early Church or in the sixteenth century, was entirely due to those who broke away. The Church gave these people ample excuse; it takes two to make a quarrel. On the other hand the fact that there were corrupt clergy and ignorant faithful in the Catholic Church of the sixteenth century does not *justify* a breakaway, though it may to some extent explain and condone it.

Professor Zernov perhaps exaggerates the importance of psychological factors in divisions. They are extremely important especially for the maintenance of those divisions; but we must not deny, in every case, a hard core of doctrinal difference. If we do, it will only lead to disappointment, such as there has been over the discussions between Anglicans and non-episcopalian communions. Love is *not* superior to truth. We can only love what we know. Truth remains supreme, but it should not remain alone; and love of our separated brethren should lead us to want to understand their point of view, and from understanding to proceed to explain how it is at least incomplete.

COLUMBA CARY-ELWES, O.S.B.

CHRIST IN HIS CHURCH. By Sister Jane Marie, O.P. (Bruce; \$3.96.)

This is 'the story of the life and action of the Church from her birth to the present day', and to judge by the very useful 'aids to learning' at the end of each section is intended for use in school and study groups. Its six hundred pages are packed with facts and as a reference book alone it is a treasure, though there are some surprising omissions: St Jerome's biblical work, for instance, goes unmentioned. On the other hand, rare justice is done to the influence of early Celtic monasticism. It is perhaps inevitable that in a book of this type historical narrative should sometimes turn into a catalogue of facts, but this is less forgivable when space is occupied by rambling discourses on the indestructible character of the Church. Nevertheless, under the guidance of a learned master this will form an invaluable textbook. The learned master—or at least easy access to source books—is a necessity because many terms will have to be defined at some length. This might have been done by maps and charts; the young student may easily lose his way among strangers, Goths, Huns, Visigoths, Franks, etc. The aids to learning, however, are fascinating: 'Write a script for a one-reel movie on the part of St Genevieve in the defence of Paris'. Especially commendable is the practice of putting questions *before* the sections, e.g. 'In your study of this unit see if you can find explanations of the following . . . "Secularism had its beginnings as far back as the thirteenth or fourteenth century".'

GERARD MEATH, O.P.

NOTICES

BROTHER POTAMIAN was a member of the teaching order of De La Salle, and his life, written by a fellow religious, W. J. Battersby (Burns Oates; 15s.), shows him as an expert 'Educator and Scientist'. Both the author and the subject of this biography reveal the fact that these teaching brothers are not only leaders of learning and education within the Church, but take their place in these fields as compeers of the great educators of the day outside the Church. Michael O'Reilly was born in Ireland, took his doctorate of Science at London Univerity, taught in London and Manhattan, and died in 1917 at the age of seventy. A man of such a reputation and energy would naturally be involved in the history of his time, so that this book is also valuable and interesting for various sidelights on the history of the Church in England at the end of the last century and the beginning of the present century.

OUR LADY OF SALETTE ought to be better known in England. One of the first and best protagonists of the apparitions was an Englishman, Archbishop Ullathorne (his book *The Holy Mountain of La Salette*, now in a ninth edition, is still the best and fullest available account). In 1931 Burns Oates and Washbourne published a good short account (fifty-two pages) by W. J. Fortier. Now, to keep the devotion at least alive, we have *Our Lady of La Salette* (Donald M. J. Langdon, Mercier Press, 3s. 6d.). It combines a plea for the extension of the Archconfraternity of Our Lady of La Salette with an account of the apparitions. It conveys, quite effectively, the essential message of La Salette: 'Unless you shall do penance you shall all likewise perish'. At La Salette, as elsewhere, our Lady pleads for penance to stay the avenging hand of God.

THE SWALLOWS OF THE GARRETT by Malachy Carroll (Mercier; 12s. 6d.), is the title of a lively account of the foundation and work of the Little Sisters of the Assumption taken from the poor Parisian's own nickname for these swiftly merciful nuns. They were founded by Fr Etienne Pernet, one of the first members of the Assumptionist Fathers, under Fr Emmanuel d'Alzon, and by Mother Marie of Jesus, his indefatigable partner in the work. At a time when Catholic social theories were still only theories in the last century these sisters came to link all classes in the service of the poor. And all over Europe they still remain a challenge to any temptation to linger in admiration of those theories. To say that they nurse the sick poor in their own homes hardly begins to convey the tremendous scope of their work, but it does describe the focal point of it all. Mr Carroll centres his story round the figure of Fr Pernet, a man of strength and precision growing out of humility. To this account Bishop Beck of Brentwood, himself an Assumptionist, has added a preface.

C.P.

IN THE ORIGIN & DEVELOPMENT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE (S.C.M. Press, 21s.), J. G. Davies rightly claims to be the first to collect the many specialist studies of this early Christian art into one complete and well-illustrated volume. For students of the spirit of the Church such a book provides a great many avenues down which he should be encouraged to venture. This book shows how literally as well as symbolically the Church was built upon foundations that influenced permanently its subsequent building. It was built out of private *homes* (Mr Davies supports the theory that the Basilica derives from the houses where the early Christians first met for their Eucharists), or from the civil courts of law or at least according to the plan of such public buildings, from the *tombs* of martyrs, and occasionally upon the foundation of *pagan temples*. From these significant beginnings the building of the church developed according to the needs of the Eucharistic liturgy and of the congregation of participants. A careful study of this comprehensive book will therefore reveal many facets of the sacramental and worshipful life of the Christian which today he often overlooks.

EXTRACTS

SECULAR INSTITUTES take the lion's share of the April-May issue of *Doctrine and Life* (Cork). The introductory paragraphs seem to make a wrong contrast between the religious state and the secular institute, including the strange remark that 'The Church, by reason of her mission, has always sought to sanctify man; at the beginning it limited itself to transforming his interior life'. This is surely not only unhistorical but suggests a misunderstanding of the religious life that is only too frequent in our day. But the number goes on to describe the foundation and work of three institutes, the 'Opus Dei', the Grail and the Little Sisters of Jesus who follow in the footsteps of Charles de Foucauld. The latter are described in the words of their foundress's 'testament'—an inspiring document intended to send these women literally into the desert among the Arabs.

Just as Jesus, when on earth, was all things to all men, so must you be—Arabs in the midst of Arabs—but above all, before all, human in the midst of your fellow men. Do not think that you must erect a barrier between yourselves and the lay world in order to exclude whatever might threaten your dignity as religious or your life of intimacy with God. Do not remain on the outskirts of human affairs. Take your part in the world as Jesus did. Enter into, and sanctify your milieu by the conformity of your life to it, by friendship, by love, by leading a life totally given over, as was that of Jesus, to the service of others, a life so mingled with other lives, so much at one with them, that you will be like the leaven which disappears into the dough and causes it to rise.

The foundress goes on, against this background, to show how their life is essentially contemplative; and to warn them that if they lose their contemplative spirit they cease to be a leaven. They are 'nomad contemplatives'. In a world that is in many ways so uprooted there could hardly be a more pertinent vocation than this.

DOROTHY DAY, who has been living this kind of vocation for years, gives a plain, matter-of-fact description of what it may mean in the American *Catholic Worker* for April:

The older I get the more I see that life is made up of many steps, and they are small affairs, not giant strides. They may loom large in our consciousness, they may look big; but they are but boulders on the way that we have to overcome. I suddenly remembered last month that I had kissed a leper, not once but twice, consciously, and I cannot say I am much the better for it. My progress has been no swifter. Once it was on the steps of Precious Blood church early one morning. A woman with cancer of the face was begging (beggars are only allowed in slums) and when I gave her money (no sacrifice on my part but merely an alms which someone had given me) she tried to kiss my hand. The only thing I could do was kiss her dirty old face with the gaping hole in it where an eye and a nose had been. It sounds like something but it was not. One gets used to ugliness so quickly. . . . Another time I was putting out a drunken prostitute with a huge toothless rouged mouth. I had been remembering how St Thérèse said that when you had to say No, when you had to refuse anyone anything, you could at least do it so that they went away a bit happier. I had to deny her a bed, but when that woman asked me to kiss her, I did, and it was a loathsome thing, the way she did it. It was scarcely a human normal mark of affection. One suffers these things and forgets them. But the daily, hourly, minutely giving up of one's own will and possessions which means poverty, is a hard, hard thing, and I don't think it gets any easier. . . .

The gestures of life are of course important, but they are not the life itself; and it is always difficult to keep perspective. We like to fancy ourselves in our gestures and then we fall. But the perspective of the life of poverty is what we need to live as Christians.

CORRIGENDUM: The price of SONGS OF ZARATHUSTRA reviewed in the May issue should have been 8s. 6d. We apologise too for the misprint in the name of the publishers, George Allen & Unwin.